THE

"HINDU MESSAGE"

A Weekly Review of Indian and World-Problems from the Hindu Standpoint.

Editors: K Sundararama Aiyar M.A., & T. K. Balasubrahmanya Aiyar B.A.

VOL. 1.] THURSDAY DECEMBER 6, 1917. [No. 7.

The **Hindu Message** stands for

(1) The Maintenance of British supremacy with self-government for India,

(2) Co-operation with the different communities of India without prejudice to Hindu Dharma,

(3) Education of the Hindus as an integral part of the Indian Nation,

(4) Advancement of Material prosperity on a spiritual basis and

(5) Dissemination of pure Hindu Culture.

Annual Subscription Rs. 6 only.

For *bona fide* students Rs. 3 only.

Single copy As. 2 only.

All business communications and remittances to be addressed to the Manager and all literary contributions and books for Review to be addressed to the Editor, THE HINDU MESSAGE, *Srirangam.*

A Vision Of India.

THE HIMALAYAS—IV.

By K. S. Ramaswami Sastri, B.A., B.L.

Induced by Indra's words bright Kama came
To move the Lord from meditation sweet.
Before him came Spring's god with light and heat
And touched the tips of trees with fragrant flame.
New-thrills did run through Nature's ancient frame:
Life's pulses moved with new and passionate beat,
And lit the eyes and quickened pace of feet,
And dowered with joy and power hearts joyless, tame.
And at this feast of fragrance, love, and light,
When scents and splendours new made heaven of earth,
There came as its presiding goddess fair
Uma to win God's love with beauty bright
And get the fruit of her sweet birthless birth
And shine with Him the world's Parental Pair.

The Hindu Message

THURSDAY EVENING 6, DEC. 1917.

Post-War Reform and Hindu Society—IV.

In our issue of the 15th November last, we published a remarkable pronouncement on "The Indian Post-War Reform Scheme" by our distinguished Christian countryman Mr. M. D. Devadoss, B.A., B.L., Barrister-at-law. One sentence in his communication states the position in India admirably:—"In the state of society as it is now in India, it will be highly injudicious to invest legislative councils having an elected majority with powers to frame laws and regulations regarding social and religious matters." This is exactly our view, and we are very glad to see that so eminent and learned an Indian Christian as Mr. Devadoss supports us. Mr. Devadoss adds:—"It is unnecessary to dilate on this topic." We think it *necessary* not only to dilate on this topic, but to dwell and dilate on it *persistently* till it is burned into the hearts of all responsible men. For, we have positive evidence to show that impatient and impetuous Hindu reformers, especially Brahmins, are only waiting to see the new reformed legislative councils set up, and they have resolved to set about their chosen task of removing from Hindu society every landmark and every institution which stands in the way of assimilating it to Western societies. If Mr. Devadoss is tolerant and sympathetic, he owes it entirely to the fact that he combines happily the conservative instincts of all good and sensible men with the broad-minded sympathies of a mind stored with a knowledge of the history of the traditions and struggles of his own religion in the past. Such men are rare among the go-a-head Indian revolutionists who are still youthful and idealistic in spirit, because they care neither to acquaint themselves with the spiritual significance of our holy and eternal Dharma nor for the lessons of history in Europe. They have trained themselves to regard Hindu society as a festering pile of corruption and degradation, and resolved to end it by any and every means at their disposal. Instead of learning that its settled conservation is a source of strength to it and has enabled it to absorb new ideas slowly while retaining what is of permanent value or suited to its changing needs and conditions, they are content to adopt what the late Mr. Justice Ranade called the *method of rebellion*.

Mr. Devadoss points out that "the Catholics are governed by the Canon Law and by the rules and regulations of their Church; they strongly resent any interference with their religious and social matters by the legislatures of the country." As regards Protestants, he says:—"The Anglicans or those who belong to the Established Church in England are also governed by their Canon Law. Subject to the authority of the Crown in England the Canon Law is supreme in the Church. The dissenting bodies have their own rules and regulations." Here in India we, Hindus, have our Dharma. But it stands on a much higher level of authority than the Canon Law. The Canon Law in

Europe consists of the formal decrees on religious and social questions passed at councils, œcumenical, general, and local, and at diocesan and national synods, and also of patriarchal decisions regarding questions of doctrine and discipline. Here in India, we have no doubt decisions given at Parishads or assemblies of Pandits in the past, but we mainly rely on the Dharma which we regard, not as man-made social regulations, but as eternal laws of the spirit revealed to us by the Rishis who saw them by their spiritual vision in the supersensuous state of Yoga-Samadhi for our unquestioned faith and practical observance.

Mr. Devadoss' advice to the Hindus is one which requires to be carefully weighed and pondered over :—"In the case of Hindus unless the whole body is in favour of a particular reform it would be improper to force it upon the majority of the people." We have already expressed our opinion in similar terms. Either the new legislatures should not be allowed to meddle with our spiritual law and ecclesiastical regulations, or at least it must be laid down that no proposal for change should be entertained in any Indian legislature if *any section* of Hindu Society should oppose it. We want no tempering with our social and spiritual laws and conventions by the legislature. Let Hindu society go on as it has done in the past, changing by the slow process of absorption or assimilation. The late Mr. Justice Ranade said :—"We inherit a civilisation and a religious and social polity which has been allowed to work their own free development on the big theatre of time. There has been no revolution, and yet the old condition of thing has been tending to reform itself by the slow process of assimilation." The revolutionary radicals of to-day should not be allowed to seek the help of the present law-making authority to change the constitution of a society which has had a peculiar history and whose supra-rational sanctions and aims are different from those of the civilisation of the West which our new men seek to imitate on purely secular or rational grounds.

Mr. Devadoss makes a suggestion for arriving at a decision when changes are proposed or brought up before the legislative authorities:—"One of the ways of adjusting the differences I can think of is by calling a representative assembly of Pandits and heads of religious institutions, mutts, etc., and asking the assembly to lay down rules and regulations in respect of matters about which all are not agreed. Such a procedure will bring out the different points of view and will have the authority of a body which by the suffrages of the people will have power to legislate for them." This may no doubt be a working plan for getting out of a difficulty, but we, Hindus, will strongly resent such a method of changing Dharma in the present condition of Indian society. We fear that, on every occasion, the dissentients will break out into open discontent, and a storm of agitation will commence of which the violence and passion can be more imagined than described. Let us recall what has only recently happened in connection with Mr. Basu's Civil Marriage Bill and the several Post-Puberty Marriage Bills in the local legislature. We think that the reformer of to-day must be content to deal with Hindu society as reformers have done in the past. Mr. Ranade has said :—"The

society to which we belong has shown wonderful elasticity in the past and there is no reason for apprehending that it has ceased to be tractable and patient and persistent in action." Hence, no legislative reform is needed or ought to be forced on Hindu society even by the proposed method of adjusting differences by the will of majorities. We are altogether opposed to the settlement of questions of Dharma by the method of appealing to majorities at meetings of Pandits. We know what failures they are likely to prove by our experience of them, even in recent years. Let our people be left to decide for themselves what to do in all social and religious matters. Mr. Devadoss himself says of the procedure he suggests :—"It will no doubt savour of democracy, but in the present state of affairs that seems to be the only way of solving the knotty questions that agitate the Hindu public." This no doubt, *appears* a sound working solution. But it can only result in discontent of a dangerous kind, and it can only be of use if a unanimous decision can be arrived at and the public mind is everywhere previously prepared to accept it.

The Convocation Address—II.

We shall now follow M. Martineau in his interpretation of the history of European enterprise in India. The Portuguese settlement in the West Coast was completed "after a series of exploits which, though celebrated by the author of the Lusiad, were none the less acts of great and useless cruelty." The Portuguese did not attempt to found an empire and only cared to secure a commercial monopoly "which for a century gave them a temporary wealth." Then the Dutch, the French and the English came in "to *share* in the profits to be derived from commercial operations in India." The Portuguese were also sinking into degradation from the effects of their own corruption; the coming of the Dutch only weakened them further. But their conquerors failed to take the place of those whom they ruined. For, the English East India Company whom the Dutch expelled from the Spice Islands, at once fell back on the Mainland (of India). The Dutch, the English, and the French were "supported in their undertakings in India by the country's own princes." M. Martineau overthrows the general belief "that, like the Portuguese, other nations of Europe settled down in India by right of conquest or by a more or less display of formidable force." He explains that "until the arrival of the Europeans the rich products of India were only exported on a small scale, and the princes of the country were often at their wit's end to balance their budget which depended on local taxes not properly defined and still harder to recover." They found it profitable to allow to Europeans "the right to export Indian products in return for the payment of export duties." At the same time, "the Europeans impressed by Indian pomp and deluded as to the real power of the Nabobs and Rajahs, took every opportunity to assert their intention to be and to remain mere traders; they inspired no distrust and were granted sufficient privileges to enable each of them to pose as his own master in his settlement." "Hindu princes were respected and perhaps feared equally by French and English."

The illusion of power in Indian princes was broken—as M. Martineau tells us—at "the battle of St. Thomas' Mount, where the little army of Paradis defeated the much stronger forces of Mafouz Khan, son of the Nabob of Arcot." But the old policy was continued for some time longer. For, when Lawrence took possession of Devicotta in 1749, he had "no idea of conquering the kingdom of Tanjore." Even when Dupleix boldly sided with two of the competitors for the succession of the titles of the Soubha of the Deccan and the Nabob of Arcot, "it is not proved that he was actuated by a desire to extend French territory." The cheap successes of the French in India "led them to think that what was so easy to confer would be equally easy to hold." But it is not known that they had or had not, any settled programme or policy. At least Dupleix never divulged to his masters in France what his policy was. It was only when the optimistic accounts he had transmitted of his position in South India were belied by the capitulation of Trichinopoly, did they feel that he must vindicate his policy of conquering and occupying Indian territory. Dupleix did send such a vindication, but too late,—for his recall had already been decided upon. His aim was to have in India itself a safe income "free from the dangers of the sea, and also independent of the remittances expected from Europe"—an income with which he could easily pay off the native dealers in advance for the Indian products which had to be exported to Europe to be sold there in order to secure the Company's profits and to pay the annual dividends to its shareholders. Hitherto they had been paid for by bullion despatched from Europe by the Company. "If for any reason, bullion did not arrive or arrived in insufficient quantity, then the business of the year was jeopardised or lost." Hence Dupleix's policy of Indian territorial occupation or conquest, "the sole object of which was to sacrifice everything to the welfare of my country, the glory of the king and the honour of the nation." "*Sacrifice everything*," indeed !,—truth, righteousness, conscience and all for the sake of plunder. M. Martineau says that Dupleix should not be blamed for not understanding his position and needs earlier than he did. He makes the sage general observation :—"Man is before all the creature of events." But European man almost always thinks, *till he fails*, that "events are before all the creature of man," and

> Plays such fantastic tricks before
> high heaven
> As make even angels weep.

M. Martineau mentions Bonaparte as his example ; but our own observation of European man, as above enunciated, is as true of Bonaparte as it is to-day of the witless Kaiser William and all other aggressionists and exploitationists, past and present, who have discarded all considerations of justice or even expediency in their unstinted and unabashed prosecution of the savagery of Mammon-worship.

M. Martineau accuses "Indian Rajahs and Nabobs" of "causing the ruin of their subjects by repeated extortions and wars more personal than national," and of thereby violating the precept of Confucius which he quotes as follows :—"Govern others so that those near you may live happy and those at a distance may come and submit themselves to your laws."

Was their misgovernment of their subjects the cause of their downfall? M. Martineau has himself, as above explained, stated the reason why Dupliex began his "policy" of overthrowing the Indian Rajahs and Nabobs. In plain words, it was the policy of the freebooter,—of the housebreaker who gets in as an honoured guest and plunders and kills the Indian host who, chivalrously welcomes and entertains him, in obedience to the precept of his divinely-revealed Vedic religion which enjoins him to regard as god-incarnate the stranger who comes in search of food and shelter.

We cannot consent altogether to the description which M. Martineau has given of the condition of government in the Indian states of the past. We have had even *recently* in existence in the Native States of India systems of government identical in all their essential features with those which prevailed therein at the time of which M. Martineau has been discoursing in this part of the Convocation address. Though there undoubtedly was a certain amount of dilatoriness and perhaps also a certain amount of disregard of straightforward dealing in minor details of administration, the ideals of our ruling princes never deviated in any considerable degree from those rigorous precepts of our Dharma-Sastras which have from time immemorial commanded the unquestioning allegiance of all Hindus. This, surely, is the reason why M. Martineau himself says that the Hindu princes of the age with which he is dealing were "*respected* equally by the French and English." They would never have commanded the *respect* of these foreigners, if their governments had been so corrupt or tyrannical as they are represented to have been.

M. Martineau says that, but for Mir Jaffir's interested desertion, "the fate of India might have been altered." To speculate on the might-have-beens of history is always an exciting pastime, but one which serves only to display human emotions as interesting as they are impotent for the gaining of any practical benefit. Our readers do not certainly require to be told to what emotions of M. Martineau's heart we are referring. They are clear as day.

The New Cult of Dis-obedience.

A REJOINDER.

1. Our correspondent's main contention is that "rational investigation into religion is not to be deemed irreverent or infructuous." We deny this altogether in the case of our Hindu Dharma, which occupies a unique position in the world as based on the Veda. Manu says,—(II. 10, 11)—

श्रुतिस्तु वेदो विज्ञेयो धर्मशास्त्रं तु वै स्मृतिः ।
ते सर्वार्थेष्वमीमांस्ये ताभ्यां धर्मो हि निर्बभौ ॥
योऽवमन्येत ते मूले हेतुशास्त्राश्रयाद्द्विजः ।
स साधुभिर्बहिष्कार्यो नास्तिको वेदनिन्दकः ॥

"By Sruti is meant the Veda and by Smriti the branch of learning which treats of Dharma (sacred morals); they must not be investigated into by relying on methods of reasoning. A Brahmin who, relying on the methods of the science of reasoning, thinks slightingly of them, must be cast out by good people, as deniers of truth and scorners of the Veda."

The Hindu maintains that Veda and Dharma are *anadi* (beginningless) and *apaurusheya* (not produced by a human author). They *must* be obeyed for the very reason that they are of "a hoary antiquity." Our correspondent says:—"Institutions and observances, social or political, are not deemed to be time-honoured and therefore unimpeachable." Hindu institutions and observances *must* be obeyed

because they are time-honoured. Sri Krishna also teaches us in the Gita (IV 15) "कुरु कर्मैव तस्मात्त्वं पूर्वैः पूर्वतरं कृतम्।" "Therefore do you perform Karma which was done by your forefathers in the early age of antiquity." Why should Hindu observances be called on "to justify their existence" and according to the methods of "critical search and inquiry?" They have always been laid down, recognised and followed as the path to the ultimate and supreme goal of human life (*Moksha*). "Ours is to do and die, ours is not to reason why" says a great modern authority. Their authority only increases with their antiquity.

Our correspondent says:—"The basis of Dharma is too sacred and stable to crumble at the touch of the critical spirit." De we not see that even Hindus of high position in social life and leaders of various sections of the community are openly discarding the Dharma. For instance, Sir Subramania Aiyer in his articles on *New Hinduism* is openly advising people in Madras and elsewhere to abandon all our *Samskaras* and *Varnadharmas*. Many are daily abandoning our Dharmas and openly setting them at naught. Hence it is best to refrain from following the time-spirit which wants us to test all things by the critical and rational methods which are resorted to by scientific investigators. In practice it is best to follow the precept of Bhagavan Sri Krishna and our great progenitor, Manu. When we want to develop the body, do we not simply obey the precepts of our physical instructors? Similarly, we must simply put into practice the exercises for the development of the spirit, viz., the precepts and rules of Dharma. We want in full measure the very "cult of obedience" which our correspondent has spoken slightingly of in his original contribution to the "Commonweal" which we subjected to some criticism with the result that it has evoked his present reply.

Swami Vivekananda—whom our correspondent has quoted in his support—is one whom we have ever admired as the most glorious and gifted of our modern teachers and promulgators of the Vedanta. At the same time he had what has been appropriately styled as "moods." So, quotations can be made from his writings sometimes to support two different or even irreconcilable views on certain matters. In each mood, he looked at a question from a different point of view and for a different purpose of his own.

2. We have ourselves pointed out (in the article to which our correspondent is replying in his present communication) what is the exact place and value of the application of reasoning in matters of Dharma:—"What reasoning can do is to reconcile any seeming conflict between the rules of Dharma proclaimed by different Rishis or texts of the Veda, and declare their exact import in their application to the exigencies of life." Our correspondent expresses the same views in a portion of his present communication. To the extent that he agrees with us, we do not think that we need make any further remarks except to say that this coincidence of views is certainly pleasant and valuable. The process of applying the methods of reasoning for reconciliation of seemingly conflicting rules of Dharma is a very different thing, however, from calling on those rules to "justify their present existence" according to the methods of "critical search and inquiry." We cannot agree to this latter process, for the reasons already stated.

3. Our correspondent says that "intellectual conviction will only deepen, and not uproot, spiritual fervour. To say that impeachment can only proceed from 'ignorance of the value of Dharma' is at the least suggestive of a nervous apprehension of an adverse verdict even before the trial has commenced." When the trial has to take place before the huckstering and cavilling tribunal of modern mercantilists and '*profiteers*,' we may be quite certain that an adverse verdict only will be given against Dharma. We confess we have the unalterable conviction—not a mere "nervous apprehension," but a conviction gained from a life-long experience,—that modern methods of reasoning about Dharma almost always land men in more or less abounding and bounding scepticism regarding their authority and value. On the contrary,

those who place implicit faith in the authority of the Holy Rishis and put them into practice end by reaping the spiritual benefits of their humility, foresight and wisdom. We are thankful to our correspondent for his fuller explanation of what he meant by his reference to priestcraft. As he wanted that our "institutions and observances" should be made to stand the test of "critical search and inquiry" and in the very next breath made the statement that "priestcraft in religion belongs to the irrevocable past," we naturally concluded that his opinion was that those institutions and observances had their origin in priestcraft. We may add that we agree with our correspondent in what he says regarding the need of improving the status and qualifications of our priests (*purohitas*). But we cannot at all agree to his statement that our priests "show the way to salvation and deliverance from the bondage of Karma." It is only the *Jnani*—not the priest or purohit—that can confer this greatest of all blessings. We feel sure that our correspondent does not fully appreciate what we, Hindus, mean by *Jnana-marga*, and its relation to Karma.

As regards the remainder of our correspondent's reply in which he explains "the purpose of his paper" published last week, we are glad to express our concurrence with its general tenor. But we must demur to his too wide statement that "the Time-spirit is real and irresistible." The Time-spirit has often to be challenged and resisted especially if we want the higher life and the lasting gains of the spirit. We will conclude by respectfully inviting our correspondent to ponder over Mr. T. J. Gerrard's characterisation of the time-spirit of our age (in his recent work called *A Challenge to the Time-spirit*) as "exaggerated subjectivism, extreme individualism, passion for revolution and lust after new sensation."

Notes and Comments.

Some time back we happened to read a speech delivered at a Social Service League meeting at Kumbakonam by the Hon'ble Mr. Justice Sadasivier, in which the learned judge pressed into his service and that of his cause what he called "the straightening of the hunchback prostitute, Kubja" by Sri Krishna. This incident in the career of the blessed Bhagavan's Incarnation is a typical one,—as it best serves to illustrate the difficult statement in the Gita (IV 9)—

जन्म कर्म च मे दिव्यमेवं यो वेत्ति तत्त्वतः ।
त्यक्त्वा देहं पुनर्जन्म नैति मामेति सोऽर्जुन ॥

"Whoever truly knows thus my divine incarnation and actions, having cast off his body, is not born again, and attains to me, O Arjuna."

According to this gracious teaching of Sri Krishna, he who knows truly the import and aim of his actions is not born again,—*i.e.*, obtains deliverance from the bondage of rebirth. So great is the difficulty of truly knowing the inner significance and purpose of the various acts of his marvellous and unmatched life on earth; so supreme, also, is its reward. And no wonder. For the blessed Bhagavan's relations with the "hunchback prostitute" after he had made her *physically* straight are so astonishingly strange that they cannot be narrated as described in the sacred record without shocking what passes as the moral sense of a "modern" audience, and its prurient delicacy of perception. God save India from contracting a moral sense, however "modern," which will be shocked to hear of the divine actions of the Supreme Being himself,—albeit they are of impenetrably mysterious import and graciously revealed to us by the glorious Rishis of old. It is unquestionable, however, that the event cannot be justified from the *modern* point of view, and so it cannot be utilised to serve the cause to which the learned judge was lending his undeniably great name and powerful support.

*
* *

Homer nods,—even the Indian Homer of to-day, our nonpareil Bengalee poet, Sir Rabindranath Tagore. In his speech at Calcutta recently on the Indian demand for self-government, he had the astonishing cocksureness to say that no mention is made in the Upanishads of the Hindu

institution of caste-division by birth. None but a very superficial reader of the Upanishads can venture on a statement so unguarded and untenable. Various references can be given, but one will suffice for the present. Take, for instance, the account given in the Brihad-Aranyaka-Upanishad of the conversation between Balaki and Ajatasatru. The former does not know the absolute reality (*Atman*) while the latter does. Yet the former is called a Brahmana in the Upanishad, and the latter a Kshatriya. Again when the former is convinced that he had not the knowledge of the Atman, he wants to become a disciple of the latter, according to the formal rules regulating the relation between a Guru and a Sishya. In reply, Ajatasatru says that it is improper that a Brahmana should become a formal sishya of a Kshatriya and so he would teach him all about the Atman without insisting on the formalities needed and established by the Sastras. If, as some modern reformers contend, only a man who knows the Atman is to be called a Brahmana, it is the king Ajatasatru who should be so called. But the Upanishad calls him only a Kshatriya, and it knows only Balaki—*Dripta-Balaki*, as it calls him, *i.e.*, Balaki with the false pride of possessing a knowledge of the Atman when in truth he had it not—as the Brahmana. The truth is that in Sanskrit the same word has often both a primary or principal meaning (शक्ति) and a secondary or subsidiary meaning (लक्षणा). The word '*Brahmana*' denotes the *Brahmana by birth* in its principal meaning, and only secondarily denotes the man with the knowledge of the Atman.

*
* *

We are of opinion that our women in all truly Hindu families have every grace and every charm that can make women the delight and the light of the home. Neither modern education nor public appearance on a platform can add anything to their present attractiveness, utility, or influence in the home. Lady Willingdon is reported to have said that, when she married her illustrious husband, she took a vow that she would never speak on a public platform. Nothing can be more truly woman-like and wife-like than this noble resolve. Our women have all taken a similar vow, and by instinct; and we see no reason why they should imitate the few Western women who pursue a different course. A very few Hindu women have in these days taken to public speaking and to appearance at public meetings and platforms. The vast majority still rest content to follow the ancient ideal of self-abnegation by which they leave all public affairs and functions to their husbands and take upon themselves the important duties allotted to them in the Hindu home by the Rishis. A few modern rich men, especially Brahmins, are impelled by the irresistible tendency to imitate Western ways and example in all matters. We confess we can neither approve of this policy, nor envy our new men or women the exaltation to which they think they have thereby attained.

*
* *

We often see that modern Indians quote the examples of Maitreyi and Gargi from the Upanishads to press on the public the need of high education for women and the importance of their appearing at public meetings and functions. We propose to bring out the truth regarding Maitreyi and Gargi. It is in the Brihad-Aranyaka-Upanishad that the names of these females—historical or not, we need not inquire—appear. Maitreyi is said to have been a Brahmavadinee, but it is not necessary for a Brahmavadinee to have been either learned in secular science or given to platform oratory or appearances at public functions. Nor does the Upanishad say that she was familiar with either secular culture or the ways of the platform. Moreover, it cannot be said that there are not even to-day among the members of truly Hindu families exemplary and demure women who are Brahmavadinees of the Maitreyi type. Their names, indeed, are not blazoned forth in the newspapers, but the Hindu public knows well some of them, and has the highest respect for them. Others there are, also, who are unknown, but are nevertheless the shining lights of their home and command the love and

reverence of their husbands, sons, and daughters.

As for Gargi, she also was evidently a Brahmavadinee. She appeared, indeed, before a public assembly of learned men convened by King Janaka of Videha. But we do not believe that she can be held up as an exemplar for Hindu women in all respects. In the first place, she seems to have possessed not a little of egotism or even vanity from which all who claim to a knowledge of Brahman ought to be, and are expected to be, free. For, when putting her first question to Yajnavalkya, she exceeded all proper limits and began to put questions on topics which were not fit to be reasoned about publicly, but only fit to be put by a disciple to a teacher and taught secretly with the aid of the Sruti. Then Yajnavalkya was compelled to administer a well-merited public rebuke by saying,—"Do not exceed the established limits of argumentative debate and question me regarding matters which are above the methods of ratiocination. Your head will clearly break to pieces if you do that." Then she was seized with fear, and desisted from all further questioning. When she was later on allowed to put a second question, she neglected the previous warning and began to question the Sage on the very topic which he had already forbidden her to enter upon. She also indulged in a good deal of self-conceit and bravado comparing her questions to two arrows inflicting insufferable torture on the enemy, and thereby implying that it would be impossible for Yagnavalkya to hope to be able to answer them. When we consider these circumstances together, we do not think that Gargi's is a character which, in spite of her possession of Brahmajnana, it is worth our women's while to cultivate. We may point out here that in making these remarks regarding Gargi, we have taken hints from the great Vedantic teacher, Srimad Appaya Dikshita.

Gnana Yoga—II.

(A lecture delivered by SWAMI VIVEKANANDA in America to a class of students *on January 8-1896.*)

We have talked of *nityanityaviveka* discriminating that which is real from the unreal. According to the Advaitist Philosophy there is only one thing which is real in the Universe, and the advaitist philosophy calls it Brahman, and everything else is unreal, manifested and manufactured out of this Brahman by the power of maya. To reach back to that Brahman is our goal. We are each one of us that Brahman, that reality, plus this maya. If we can get rid of this maya, or ignorance, then we become what we really are. Now, according to this philosophy, each man consists of three parts—Body, then comes the internal organ, or the mind, and behind that is what is called the Atman, the self. This body is only the external coating, and the mind is only the finer part of this body, but the Atman is the real perceiver, the real enjoyer, the being in this body, who is working this body by means of the internal organ and the mind. This Atman is without beginning and without end, and it is the only existence in the human body which is immaterial. Because it is immaterial it naturally follows that it cannot be a compound, and because it is not a compound therefore it does not obey the laws of cause and effect, and so it is immortal. That which is immortal must have no beginning, because everything with a beginning must have an end. It also follows that it must be formless; there cannot be any form without matter, and everything that has form must have a beginning and an end. We have none of us seen a form which had not a beginning and will not have an end, because the form comes out of a combination of force and matter. This chair has a peculiar form, that is to say a certain amount of matter is acted upon by a certain amount of force, and made to assume a particular position, and that position is therefore the result of a combination of matter and force, and no combination can be eternal; there must come to every combination a time when it will dissolve. So all forms have a

beginning and an end, and are perishing, just as we see with our own bodies; we know our body will perish; it had a beginning and it will have an end. So with everything that we can conceive of as having a form; it must have a beginning and an end, birth and death. But the Self, having no form, cannot be bound by the laws of beginning and end. It is existing from infinite time; just as time is infinite and space is infinite, so is the Self an infinite. Next, being infinite, it must be all-pervading. It is only form that makes any condition and limit to a certain amount of space; that which is formless cannot be confined in space. So, according to Vedanta, your, and my, and every one's self, the Atman, is omnipresent. You are as much in the Sun now as in this earth, as much in England as in America. The action takes place where the body is; the Self acts through the mind, and the mind is limited. So is the body, and where the mind and body exist, there the Self acts. Death means the dissolution of this mind and body; this body and mind will be broken to pieces, dissolved. What will alone remain, is the Samskara the sum-total of the actions. Each work we do, each thought we think, is producing a samskara, an impression upon the mind, and the sum-total of these impressions becomes the tremendous force which is called "character." The character of a man is what he has created himself; it is the result of the sum-total of the mental and physical actions that he has done in his life, and this samskara is the force which gives the next direction to us after our death. A man dies; what becomes of his body? It falls down and goes back to the elements, and so the mind, which is also finer material, breaks into pieces, his brain goes, his nervous system, and everything goes, and only the samskara remains, the sum-total of the forces that have been acting upon him. Why does not this mind dissolve? Because the finer the material the more persistent it is. This will dissolve in the long run, and that is what we are struggling for, but it does not dissolve as easily as the body; being very fine it is more persistent. For instance, the best illustration that comes to my mind is that of the whirlwind. Different currents of air coming from different directions meet, and at the meeting point they become united, and the forces being united, go on circulating, and as they circulate they create a body and raise the dust and bits of paper, and everything in the road, and go on gyrating, and frequently they drop these bits at one place, only to go on to another, and go on circulating, raising the material which is before them. So these forces called pranas in Sanskrit come together and form this gyrating motion, and when the body falls down, the little bit of dust is gathered up and made into a new body and moves forward, and when this falls another rises, and so on. It goes on from one spot to another, until when it goes down most of the dust drops, only a little remains. Force cannot travel without matter. So when this body falls down a little of the mind-stuff remains, adheres to the samskara, and then it goes on to another point, and raises up another whirl from fresh material, with these little bits of material combined in it, and they begin this gyrating motion again, and so it travels from place to place until the force is all spent, and then it falls down, ended.

(*To be continued.*)

Pencillings by the Way—V.

BY S. P. THIAGARAJAN.

The report on vaccination in our Presidency during the past official year has been issued. We read that vaccine operations showed a decrease of over five and a half per cent and cases of re-vaccination about 19 per cent. Whether this decline is due to any declared antipathy to vaccination on account of its certainly injurious and dangerous effects, we have no means of ascertaining. The Sanitary Commissioner suggests that the protective value of vaccination would become better appreciated should primary vaccination be made compulsory throughout the Presidency and re-vaccination at least in tracts immediately threatened with small-pox epidemics. The question of conferring on Presidents of District Boards the power to extend the compulsory

provision of vaccination to re-vaccination in areas where small-pox assumes epidemic proportions is suggested as worthy of consideration in connection with the proposed amendment of the Local Boards' Act. The accomplished doctor who edits *Justice*, true to his professional instincts, trusts that the Government will take note of the suggestion. At present, primary vaccination is compulsory only in municipal towns and in a few selected areas within District Board limits. Re-vaccination is optional throughout the Presidency. Certainly if both primary vaccination and re-vaccination were made compulsory throughout this country, the Faculty would come in for a good deal of emoluments. The people are like to have no corresponding advantages; on the other hand there is the certainty of the subjects of vaccination falling victims to numerous dreadful diseases. If the statistics relating to the health of the Presidency be carefully scrutinised, as I hope to do one of these days, it could easily be shown that vaccination is a hindrance rather than a help to public health. It is bad enough that there should be a vested interest to maintain the excellence of vaccine: it is bad enough that the hard-earned money of a people should be squandered in maintaining an army of vaccinators and deputies. But it is worse still and it is extremely reprehensible that members of the Faculty, whose interest is bound up with this evanescent bubble, should lecture to us on the prophylactic virtues of vaccination and seek to draw the net tighter. A more astounding example of professional cupidity and hypocrisy it will be hard to find than the attempts to bolster up vaccination. The student of the vaccination theory, its history and the history of that medical mountebank, Jenner, will wonder how a learned body of men could have so taken leave of their senses. Such a study will bear out the charges of empiricism and charlatanry levelled against the Faculty in an earlier note of this series. It is not a difficult matter to lay bare this vaccination delusion. It is not however my present purpose. Among many valuable authorities on this subject, I may for the present refer the curious to the luminous pages of Dr. Creighton's *Jenner and Vaccination*, wherein the subject is treated in quite a scholarly manner.

Among the many exploded prophylactic virtues of vaccination, that one still does duty in India whereby vaccination is supposed to be a sure preventive of small-pox. The tangled skein of this ugly delusion cannot be unravelled now. The report of the health of Leicester for 1916, issued by its medical officer, Dr. Millard, lies before me in the shape of an extract from a "home" paper. For a town of some 230,000 inhabitants, we see that vaccination is declining; and yet, in the section of the report, entitled 'small-pox,' we read, "No case of small-pox occurred in Leicester in 1916." Pro-vaccinists have always been gnashing their teeth whenever Leicester is mentioned. We see from the report—we are indebted to the *Vaccination Enquirer*—that while the average yearly number of vaccinations since 1885 has been 10 per cent of births, the number for 1916 was only 4·7 per cent. With the single exception of an imported case in 1913, there has been no small-pox in Leicester since 1906, and no deaths from small-pox since 1904. Dr. Millard says: "The fact that the whole country has been so free from small-pox during the last 12 years in spite of the steadily increasing neglect of infant vaccination, indicates, certainly, that other factors rather than infantile vaccination are controlling the incidence of the disease." The whole method whereby not only small-pox but various other zymotic diseases have been forced to quit *unvaccinated* Leicester is described at length by Mr. J. T. Bigg in his "*Leicester: sanitation versus vaccination*," which would give the reader an idea of the right perspective from which questions of public health ought to be viewed.

I quoted in these pages recently an extract from Dr. Rowlette's article in the *Lancet*. That article dealt with the "Limitations of Vaccine Treatment." The Sanitary Commissioner to the Government of Madras and Dr. Nair would apparently stand aghast to hear the title of the article. Yet in that article among various

ingenious explanations of the failure of the vaccine treatment, wearisomely familiar to all antivaccinists, Dr. Rowlette reminds his readers that "vaccine is only specific at second-hand, *i.e.*, it works by stimulating the natural resistance of the body, and therefore when the body is exhausted, it is "useless as a trumpet-call in a deserted barrack-square." According to this learned Doctor, vaccine, in short, is useless when most wanted and perhaps superfluous in other cases, for if the body is in full possession of its natural powers of resistance, might it not have triumphed over diseases without the assistance of vaccines? Apparently, as a contemporary observes, vaccine, like Talleyrand, "only goes to the assistance of the stronger party." Dr. Rowlette is a firm supporter of vaccination. But he gives up his case when he admits that "one rarely gets the best results from vaccine treatment unless one makes full use of whatever concomitant measures his own experience or that of others may suggest." The reader, I believe, is as much tired of the Doctor's tergiversations as I am and but for the importance of the subject I would not drag him through all this miasma. The fact outstanding in the Doctor's article is that vaccination is not good enough for the public, though it may be good enough for the doctors and for the firms who manufacture vaccine at a goodly profit. The fact is as remarked by a distinguished American doctor it (i.e. to be a good doctor) requires honesty of the pure brand, honesty with oneself, honesty in thinking. How many, many physicians, he asks, keep still about vaccination though they know of its wrong, excusing their attitude by thinking they can be of more use by securing certificates of exemption for a few if silent, than by asserting their convictions in the face of organised medicine. The Doctor observes—I am quoting from his brilliant volume on "Food Fundamentals"—"That physician who fully grasps the truth that disease is largely the product of wrong habits of living, and undertakes to teach his following this truth, is met not only with listless hearers, but with the opposition of a thoroughly entrenched medical profession who thoroughly understand how to make use of the associated press; and with the daily remarks of ministers and editors who unwittingly enforce and reinforce error. He builds character by losing good friends, good patients, good money and refusing to teach tuncombe instead of truth." The truth of the matter is that, as is remarked in the first part of the work, the mass of physicians of all schools are ignorant of the fundamentals put forth by the great physicians of all ages on how to cure and prevent diseases by right living and eating. Not even the best schools of this or any country offer such information to their medical students. They are crazy about germs and serums and turn out doctors who are crazy on these same things.

One more extract the kindly reader will pardon. In a special chapter on "Germs," we read :—

"There is no greater obstacle to right teaching about health and disease to-day than the erroneous teaching about germs. The ordinary conception and teaching is that the multiplying of poisonous germs cause the disease, and every effort is put forth to kill the germs. Accumulation of poisons do the damage, not the accumulation of germs, and every effort should be put forth to prevent the accumulation of the poisons. It is taught that before a germ can cause disease there must be a lowered resistance of the body. The lowered resistance is disease and is present before the poison germ makes its appearance. The thing that brought about the lowered resistance is the cause of the disease.

From this point of view how absurd it is to inject poisons into the system by vaccination, the worst of all being that for smallpox.

Malarial fever has not been banished by killing the mosquito. Draining and drugging the marshes may have done away with the mosquito, but it also purifies the air from decomposition products, and here is the explanation of the results. Breathe the air from decaying vegetation, eat enough to have the food decay in the intestines, wear enough clothing to close the pores of the skin, and with a suitable atmospheric temperature and humidity you will have malarial fever where there is never a mosquito."

AN APPEAL
BY HIS EXCELLENCY THE GOVERNOR
ON BEHALF OF
MADRAS WAR FUND.

The certainty that our troops at the Front will have to face another winter campaign and a continuance of all the hardships incidental to Active service has

rendered it necessary for those to whom the administration of the Madras War Fund has been entrusted to consider seriously how to make provision for the further maintenance of the Hospital Ship 'Madras,' the River Hospital Ship 'Sikkim,' the Madras Gardeners' Corps now working in Mesopotamia, and the other beneficent agencies of the Fund, which it has already supported for a period far exceeding the original calculations. It is evident that this can only be secured by special efforts on behalf of the Fund which, as can be seen from recently published report of the Transactions up to 31st March 1917, has been maintained partly by donations and partly by monthly subscriptions. The monthly subscriptions to the Fund have never equalled its normal monthly expenditure, of which they now fall short by half a lakh, this deficiency being met out of the capital resources, which—built up by donations—must thus in time become exhausted. Looking to the present conditions of the tremendous conflict which calls for our utmost efforts, it is now imperatively necessary to replenish the capital resources of the Fund and so to maintain, as hitherto has been done, its normal expenditure.

As compared with other provinces the Madras Presidency and some other portions of Southern India have until now been relatively free from the burden and drain of Military recruitment. The repeated endorsement by the highest authorities of the work of the Madras War Fund, and of the Hospital Ship 'Madras' in particular has added to the pride of the Presidency in these symbols of its loyalty and gratitude. Moreover the contributors who have throughout supported the Fund as a practical and beneficent instrument of their generosity, and incidentally a visible token of their grateful recognition of their immunity from other burdens borne elsewhere in larger measure by others, would view any reduction or restriction of its work with feelings of deepest regret and mortification.

This appeal for further donations is now issued, in the confident belief that it is only necessary to publish the urgent need of further assistance to elicit an immediate response and place beyond doubt the continuity of this good work for a further substantial period of time ; and in the hope that it will specially commend itself individually and collectively to all those to whose liberal support the great and continuing success of the Fund hitherto has been due.

PENTLAND,

Governor of Madras and
President of the Madras War Fund.

Donations should be sent to——

THE MILITARY SECRETARY,

GOVERNMENT HOUSE, MADRAS.

The following is the first list of donations received to the above appeal:—

His Excellency the Governor	Rs. 1,500
His Highness the Maharaja of Travancore, G.C.S.I., G. C. I. E.	1,00,000
The Raja of Venkatagiri	50,000
The Raja of Pithapuram	50,000
His Highness the Raja of Cochin	20,000
and increase of monthly subscription from Rs. 750 to Rs. 1,000	
Zamindar of Paralakimedi	10,000
The Rani Sahiba of Wadhwan	10,000
The Raja of Sandur	6,000
Messrs. Wrenn, Bennet & Co., Ltd.	3,000
Messrs. Gordon, Woodroffe & Co.	2,500
Messrs. Wilson & Co	2,500
Messrs. Parry & Co,	2,500
Messrs. Best & Co., Ltd.	2,500
Messrs. W. A. Beardsell & Co., Ltd.	2,500
The Zamindarni of Kolanka and Viravaram estates	2,000
The Maharaja of Bobbili, G.C.I.E.	1,000
Messrs. P. Orr & Sons, Ltd.	1,000
Messrs. Spencer & Co., Ltd.	1,000
Messrs. Oakes & Co., Ltd.	1,000
Messrs. Mc Dowell & Co., Ltd.	1,000
Messrs. Fraser & Ross	1,000
Mr. F. D. Bennett	1,000
Mr. Wales	500
Mr. Everett	500
The Zamindar of Bhadrachalam and Polavancha	500
Messrs. Simpson & Co.	250
Sir P. S. Sivaswami Ayyar, K.C.S.I. C.I.E.	200

Correspondence.

The views of our contributors and correspondents do not necessarily reflect the policy of this Review—Ed.

Indian Self-Government Scheme and Hindu Social Reform.

Sir,

In the penultimate paragraph of your editorial note on 'Post-war Reform and Hindu Society' in the Hindu Message of the 22nd November, the following occurs:— "Where the entire Hindu community *unanimously* demands or supports a change, the Government may indeed allow it to pass, but *not* if *any* section of it, however small opposes a proposed measure." This is verily a halting position for the Sanathana Dharmic Hindus to take. The real view of the matter is forcibly and with precise truth expressed in the succeeding last para, "that no earthly power can claim to set aside or modify the eternal laws of Dharma in such a manner as to injure the structural and functional coordination of its parts. If the society has strayed away from its original and fundamental constitution in any respect, the present secular power cannot interfere." This and this alone ought to be the sole and firm bed-rock on which an undaunted stand must ever be stoutly made. No question of majority or minority, of a small section or big section shall ever be allowed to enter into the consideration of the Hindu social problem which is purely of a religious basis and character. Social and religious institutions must be distinctly and absolutely placed beyond the scope and purview of the secular legislatures. This fact must be brought out clearly in the joint memorandum of the Advaitha and Asthika and Orthodox Hindu Sabhas for particular attention of the final arbiters of the Indian Political re-constitution, so that social and religious problems might be placed above all secular law of the land by a clear statutory provision to that effect. The Hindu society, unlike the social institutions of other nations in the world, is unique and has never been made by any body of secular and irreligious laymen, but was created by God-inspired sages and seers, nay, by the Almighty Lord Himself— चातुर्वर्ण्यं मया सृष्टं गुणकर्मविभागशः Bhagavad Gita-- without any reference to unanimity, majority or minority among the members of the Hindu Aryan Society. It stands to reason, therefore, that those who have never had any hand or voice in the build of the Hindu Society cannot have any manner of right to unmake and mar it. Even the Hindu kings, in their days, could not interfere with social institutions in any manner, except for maintaining them in strict conformity with the scriptures and Dharma Sastras. The kings could make no laws inconsistent with the Dharma. Laws were made alike by sages for both kings and coolies to obey, each order being strictly enjoined to observe its Dharma, on pain of penalties in default, to be severally suffered either here or in worlds yonder. That being so, who is now this puny man with egotistic flush, to unmake and mar, mend or end the society of the Lord's creation? This basic vital principle of the Divine origin of Hindu society must now and ever hold good, so far as the Hindus are concerned, whoever be the Sovereign for the time being or whatever be the scheme and form of political government set up under his command. If H. H. The Gaekwar of Baroda were but true to his ancient Kshatriya ancestry, to the immemorial glorious Hindu ideals and traditions, had he but remembered the mental agony which tormented the Master-mind Arjuna on the prospect of Varna-sankara and the untold diabolical evils in its wake, to the family, the society and the nation, and which he so patriotically and religiously displayed during his discourse with Lord Sri Krishna on the battlefield of Kurukshetra more than five thousand years ago, had H. H. but cared to do credit to the little of Aryan blood that surely yet runs in his veins, he would certainly not have ushered into an astonished Hindu world, his Caste-usages Bill—a downright negation of the vital principles of the Aryan Hindu society.

But there is one thing. Our Social Reform friends are not to blame for their views. They admire and adore the eternally glorious Swami Vivekananda as much as and no less than anybody else. They have safely treasured up his observation, '*India will never be Europe until she dies*'. Europe stands for an all-round national advance and progress. If India is to progress so, she cannot but

assimilate herself to Europe. This assimilation is not possible with her present life. She must die an unnatural death, to be born and live again on European model. It is this death of hers, they, *Our Social Deformers and Defamers*, are striving their utmost to hasten and accelerate. India's death means, death of her Social constitution indissolubly intertwined with her Eternal Religion. Ha, ha! what a glorious goal indeed! All glory to them! We can only offer pity for their colossal ignorance, or contempt for their studied perversity, whichever be their attitude due to. These so-called friends of India's welfare do not evidently recognise and realise the underlying principle of the Divine Scheme of Universe. Let them read for this once, these notable words of Dr. Ananda Coomaraswamy.— "Each race must contribute something essential to the world's civilsation in the course of its own self-expression and self-realisation. The character built up in solving its own problems, in the experience of its own happiness and of its own misfortunes is itself a gift which each race offers to the world. The essential contribution of India, then, is her *Indianness*; her greatest humiliation would be to substitute or to have substituted for this own character (*Sva-bhava)* a cosmopolitan veneer, for then she must come before the world empty-handed." The attempt of the Social Reform leagues in the country can therefore be characterised, to put it mildly, as but wild-goose chase, an attempt on the part of the tiny egotistic man to rule out the will of the Lord who has chosen, in His Supreme Wisdom, to give the Hindu a social constitution for all time which it is not for man to mend.

One's wonder is—'Are these self-elected Social Reformers really blind to the ultimate issues and perilous consequences involved in the absurd pursuit of their mad suicidal programme? Do they really shut their eyes to the tremendous volume of unbiassed and ever-increasing opinion of the many noble and fair-minded savants and scholars of the West on the unique splendour and grandeur of the Hindu society? Do these Reformers ever care to look beyond their crude ken, petty perspective? Do they really feel they are Aryans, descendants of the Aryan sages and seers of yore and really constitute an Aryan brotherhood, while all the time they think, speak, strive and act in quite an un-Aryan fashion? Here is what a Frenchman no less than His Excellency M. Martineau, Governor of the French settlements in India, has observed in the course of his Convocation Address to the Graduates of the Madras University on the 23rd November 1917, on an aspect of the Hindu social laws and otherwise as a piece of general advice:— "Brahminic India, however, seems to have withstood better than any nation in the world the convulsions caused by those ambitions. It is marvellous that some kingdoms were able to last for twelve to fifteen centuries ....The Hindu of those days, like the Hindu of to-day, was mild, far from quarrelsome, combining a great delicacy of manners with a certain indifference to political controversies. He was ready to obey without being compelled to it by force. A system of law beyond the comprehension of our Western customs, allowed every man to rise in his own sphere up to the highest steps of fortune, without however making it possible for him to overstep the bounds of a social order where covetousness and rivalries are the first results of liberty. The long political peace of the Peninsula is doubtless due to that system of law. Stability in institutions brought forth to a certain extent the stability in arts and literature......Happy are the people wise enough to remain faithful to themselves, to their past and to their traditions." This is the latest testimony from a European source. Will our social reform friends ponder over these words and divert their energy to a better cause, to the securing of a sort of self-government which, while not lending itself to any mischievous scheme of disintegrating and demoralizing and destroying the eternal Hindu society will prove a machinery of political administration worthy of a glorious and holy India?

Eternal of the Lord,

Point Pedro. J. S. R. SARMA.

Printed and Published by T. K. Balasubrahmanya Aiyar B.A. at the Sri Vani Vilas Press, Srirangam.